

I wish to register my strong opposition to the above proposal.

1. Contrary to what others might have you to believe, there is no constitutionally-guaranteed right to Internet access in this country. People who live, work or operate their businesses in rural or less well served (from a broadband perspective) areas of America have made a choices, often conscious, well-reasoned ones, about where they wish to live, work, or conduct their businesses, after full consideration of any concomitant difficulties. These people are free to move as their needs and preferences change, just as they have been able to do for centuries.

If (today or at some point in the future) a sufficient number of people in rural areas come to the conclusion that high speed Internet access is of sufficient value to them that they are willing to pay for it, they are free to take appropriate action. There is no one (and nothing) standing in their way. As we have seen over and over, given a need, the market will provide.

The FCC is not in (indeed the federal government should not be) in the business of making, countermanding, facilitating, or even influencing individual or business decisions. Further, the FCC should not allow itself to become the pawn of or to be unduly influenced by those who would stand to make a buck (or many billions of bucks) from BPL.

2. While it has been technically demonstrated that it is possible to distribute broadband Internet service over power lines, it has not been proven that BPL is any more attractive, from an economic standpoint than other, existing forms of service, e.g., DSL, Cable, wireless dish. Indeed, as has been shown in comments filed elsewhere to this docket, the cost of equipment required to install and maintain such service would appear to be no less expensive than (and probably exceeds that) for other, established forms of service and perhaps this is one reason why perceived beneficiaries of BPL been holding back. Those driven by the entrepreneurial urge to service under-served markets will find no shortage of ways to do so, both here in the U.S. and abroad.

3. BPL presents a substantial interference threat to existing, legally-authorized spectrum users such as amateur radio users. Comments previously filed by others, both during the Initial comment period and in this Reply period have made this quite abundantly. BPL proponents have failed to disprove (indeed, have largely ignored) such comments, choosing to focus instead, on the perceived "benefits" to users of the service -- users who may or may not materialize. I doubt I am the only person in America who finds it curious that the would-be beneficiaries of BPL are not stepping forward in droves to support the current proposal.

For the foregoing reasons, and others, I register my objections to the BPL proposal. I encourage the FCC staff and its Commissioner to do the same.

Thank you.

Raymond T. Murphy

